DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 612 EC 052 071

TITLE	The Impact of Resource Room Instruction on Principal and Teachers' Attitudes.
INSTITUTION	Marshall Independent School District, Tex.
PUB DATE	[73]
NOTE	50p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Marshall Independent School District, Marshall, Texas 75670
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; Elementary School Students; *Exceptional Child Research; Individualized Instruction; Language Handicapped; *Learning Disabilities; Program Evaluation; *Resource Centers; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Evaluated were the attitudes of 10 principals and 38 teachers (20 regular classroom teachers and 18 teachers who were voluntarily individualizing instruction) toward an instructional program for language and learning disabled elementary students based on the resource room concept. Principals and those teachers who had volunteered to individualize indicated positive feelings toward the program. Regular teachers reported limited use of resource room materials and limited coordination with the resource teacher. (See EC 052 070 for a companion study). (DB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 078612

THE IMPACT OF RESOURCE ROOM INSTRUCTION ON PRINCIPAL AND TEACHERS' ATTITUDES

AN EVALUATION STUDY

MARSHALL INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

MARSHALL, TEXAS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EC052071

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of interviews of principals and two groups of teachers in nine elementary schools and one middle school in the Marshall Independent School District. Four ESC staff interviewers collected information from subjects using one of three interview schedules on which responses were recorded.

The results indicate that principals in charge of L/LD programs have very positive attitudes toward these programs. Regular classroom teachers who volunteered to individualize have similiarly positive feelings toward the L/LD program and its impact upon the school system. The remaining group of regular teachers who individualized their teaching reported limited use and sharing of resource room materials and equipment with the L/LD teacher.

These results generally indicated that principals and teachers who had volunteered to individualize had the most positive attitudes and perceptions of the L/LD program when the three groups of interviewees were compared. Responses and comments demonstrate an enthusiasm and unity of purpose which appeared to underscore their confidence in the effectiveness of the program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	
INTRODUCTION	1
RESULTS	
Part I - Principals	2
Part II - Regular Teachers	10
Part III - Regular Teachers Volunteering To Individualize	19
Part IV - Parent Involvement	24
SUMMARY	25
APPENDIX	29

INTRODUCTION

This four part status study includes perceptions of ten principals regarding language/learning disabilities and individualized instruction. Further, feelings, attitudes, and perceptions are reported of two groups of teachers who volunteered to individualize instruction in their classes.

The process evaluation questions generally concerned the district's L/LD program in terms of its effectiveness as an ongoing process. More specifically, classroom management, overall instruction arrangements, and perceived program impact were investigated.

Four interviewers were selected from the staff of Region VII Education Service Center to participate in a one-day training session led by the Director of the Center for Research and Evaluation at North Texas State University. Interviewer trainees role-played the teacher and the principal for the purposes of establishing an approximate period of time required to complete the interview form and to isolate potential problem areas which might arise. Answers to these questions were agreed upon in order to improve interviewer reliability.

The report format for providing feedback from these interview sessions includes the "evaluation question," followed by results of related items from the interview schedule. Each items shows responses in terms of percentage in each category. Qualifying comments made by the interviewee have been included where they were felt to have a possible influence upon percentage results. A summary illustration has also been included for providing fast references to responses in terms of both percent and frequency.

RESULTS

Part I. The first process evaluation question relating to the interview of principals stated, "Do principals perceive the L/LD program as having a favorable impact upon parental attitudes toward schools in the MISD and the ability of schools to meet the needs of students?" Three questions on the interview schedule related to principal perception of parental attitudes. The first was, "Has the number of parent problems

created by educational needs not being met subsided since 1970?" Seventy percent of the respondents felt that the number of problems had subsided while ten percent felt that the number had not decreased and twenty percent were undecided. One principal felt that many problems had not been related to L/LD.

To the second question, "Is the majority of parent feedback one of satisfaction because the school is offering this kind of program?", one-hundred percent of the principals responded "yes." One principal commented that he did not get much feedback from parents while another qualified his response that in "most cases" satisfaction was observed. Another added that much of the feedback was due to the positive results seen in the children.

A third question relating to the evaluation item was stated as follows, "Do you have parents requesting their children be placed in L/LD?" Eighty percent of the principals responded yes, reporting an average of six such requests per principal. Two principals reported that there was a waiting list and that parent requests had had to be refused in several instances.

The second process evaluation question was stated as follows, "Do principals perceive the L/LD program as reducing discipline problems among L/LD students?" Ninety percent of

the principals reported that L/LD students as a group were not discipline problems in the resource room. Ten percent responded that, to a limited extent, these students were a discipline problem. However, in reference to the same students, forty percent of the principals reported that as a group they were a discipline problem in the classroom. The remaining sixty percent reported that these L/LD students did not create discipline problems in the classroom. Principals commented that problems had generally reduced in frequency and that, even in the regular classroom, number of incidences had declined; Self-image of students had appeared to improve.

Seventy-two percent of the principals queried reported that they felt that discipline problems resulted because students' educational needs were not being met. Fourteen percent of the respondents did not agree and fourteen percent were undecided as to the caused of these problems. One-third of the interviewees felt that many factors were involved. Others added that in some cases the source was a medical problem, such as emotionality or difficulties at home of which school personnel are unaware. One principal reported that there may not be a specific antecedent but that the cause may lie in a more general "background problem." Other principals reported that discipline problems in general had been reduced in number as a result of his staff's cooperative attitude.

A third evaluation question was stated as follows, "Has the L/LD program, in the opinion of the principal had a favorable impact on the attitudes and the instructional program or regular classroom teachers?" Five interview items related to this question. Ninety percent of the principals responded affirmatively to the first item which asked if the L/LD program had created positive changes in the instruction in the regular classrooms. Ten percent were undecided. One respondent commented that while more attention was being focused upon individualization, much was already being done (prior to the appearance to L/LD). Eighty percent of the principals felt that changes could be attributed to students' being in a resource room. Twenty percent did not agree. One negative respondent reported that, "teachers (regular classroom) have taken advantage of some instruction given to L/LD."

Eighty percent of the principals queried reported that teacher attitudes had become more positive after they (teachers) had seen the productiveness of the resource room. Ten percent disagreed, and ten percent were undecided. One person qualified his response with a comment that good communication was a pre-requisite.

When questioned as to the extent that the L/LD staff had educated the regular staff, principals responded as follows: (1) Eighty percent said that regular teachers were more able to

distinguish between a slow learner and a learning disabled child while twenty percent disagreed. (2) Eighty percent felt that regular staff members were more able to diagnose problems from test data. (3) Seventy percent felt that regular teachers had become more skilled at diagnosing problems from their students' daily work. (4) Eighty percent of the principals reported that regular teachers could more expertly diagnose problems from behavior patterns as a result of regular teacher contact with the L/LD staff. One principal remarked that he felt that many teachers had previously had the above competencies while another commented that, in his opinion, he did not feel that teachers should be expected to have these diagnostic abilities.

Responses to one interview item were evenly divided. This question related to difference between attitudes and work habits of the resource teacher and the regular teacher. Fifty percent of the principals felt there was a difference while fifty percent disagreed. The negative respondents commented that a difference had existed in the early days of the program but had since diminished or disappeared completely. The affirmative comments focused upon greater individual attention to students made possible by reduced class size. Some of the principals felt that more dedication and greater effort was put forth by L/LD teachers. Others reported a decline in jealousy and differences of opinion among all teachers.

The fourth process evaluation question was, "Has the L/LD program, in the opinion of principals, proven to meet cost-effectiveness expectations in the MISD?" Five items on the principal questionnaire related to this question. To the first, ninety percent of the principals responded that they felt the overall effect and the final product were worth the expense and the time that had been put into the L/LD Development Design. Ten percent of the respondents disagreed. One principal felt that value lay in the L/LD program's contribution to practical research; another reported that, without the L/LD program, he felt that individualization would not have been accepted.

The question, "Do you think the effectiveness has been greater in this program than in other new programs this district had implemented?" drew an eighty percent affirmative response with a twenty percent undecided reaction from principals. From among the "undecided" group, there was the feeling reported that an affirmative response was difficult due to absence of comparison criteria.

One question related to program cost effectiveness and asked, "Are you budgeting your school money to buy material and equipment for individualized instruction?" Ninety percent of the principals responded affirmatively while the remaining ten percent negative respondents reported that budgets were written at the central office.

Two additional interview questions related to positive and negative features of the program. Principals observed improvement among both teachers and students. Teachers reportedly appeared more excited, enthusiastic, and better rewarded for their efforts. L/LD students experienced a wide range of benefits from the program. Among these were, "increased happiness, reduced pressures, acquisition of independent study skills, and intransic motivation." Other changes were, "improved self attitude and attitude toward school, and improved progress made by students." Principals approved of "the absence of failure in the program, the student's ability to proceed at his own rate, the development of skills he had been formerly unable to develop, the experience of growth when he had average or above average intelligence, and, in general, the positive results obtained in growth patterns among all levels of ability."

There were portions of the program, however, which principals felt could be eliminated without harming the overall plan. These included, "candy rewards, isolating the children, and removal of furniture and equipment from the regular teachers' classrooms." Principals further commented that "interpersonal relations between faculty members could be emphasized more," and that "the present format appeared somewhat difficult to adopt to a twenty-eight student classroom."

The final process evaluation question asked, "Has adequate building level scheduling of L/LD classes been possible?" The interview elicited an eighty percent "no" response to the question, "Has the special scheduling that the Marshall ISD L/LD program requires been difficult to organize." Twenty percent of the principals felt that the program had been difficult to organize and schedule. Ninety percent of the principals did not mind the extra work, however. One of the negative responses was qualified in that the question did not apply as there was no L/LD program in this principal's building.

Interviewers reported that principals responded with positive comments much more frequently and with much greater variety than with negative remarks. These negative comments were generally qualified so as to make the interviewer aware that, in general, the respondent's attitude toward the L/LD program was positive.

Illustrations of the information above appear in tables at the end of the report. Questions are presented in parallel order to the text material, and interview items are grouped with the corresponding process evaluation questions. A summary of the information concerning principals' responses appears in the general summary at the end of this report.

Part II. Twenty teachers were interviewed in order to assess changes they had made in their instruction as a result of working with L/LD resource room teachers. Teachers were selected at random and were interviewed with the aid of "regular classroom teachers' Interview Schedule-No. 2". Interviews were conducted by Region VII personnel.

Questions on the Interview Schedule were designed to answer process evaluation questions by means of responses reported in terms of frequency and percent. Seven evaluation questions were used to provide a criterion for feedback from twenty teachers who were interviewed.

The first of seven questions asked, "Do regular classroom teachers who have been working with L/LD teachers report they are using audio tape recorders to a greater extent in their instructional program as a result of working with the resource room teachers?" Fifteen percent of the interviewees reported that they had borrowed the tape recorder from the resource teacher, while eighty-five percent had not.

Additional interview data relating to the use of tape recorders indicated that thirty-five percent of the regular classroom teachers had started using the tape recorder as a result of working cooperatively with L/LD teachers with learning disabled children. The

remaining sixty-five percent had not been initiated to the use of this machine through contact with L/LD teachers. It was further ascertained that seventy percent of the interviewees had perfected their skill in using the tape recorder through attending workshops. The remainder of the group had attended no such workshops.

The impact of L/LD teachers on the use of the tape recorder was further delineated by data showing that fifteen percent of the interviewees had borrowed tapes from the resource teacher while eighty-five percent had not. Further, fifteen percent of the regular teachers had jumped for their own instructional use tapes that had been devised by L/LD teachers. The remaining eighty-five percent had not duplicated tapes belonging to L/LD teachers. Only ten percent of the interview respondents had listening stations and tape recorders in daily operation in their classrooms. Ninety percent of the group did not make such regular use of this medium.

Six teachers (thirty percent of the respondents) made various comments indicating the use of the tape recorder, alone, or the availability of listening stations without a tape recorder, or the inability to use certain pieces of equipment. An additional comment included plans for greater utilization upon receipt of the listening station and tape recorder.

Of the group questioned, twenty-five percent of the teachers reported the use of tape recorders and listening stations prior to 1970 while seventy-five percent had not used both. Two individuals added that they had used the tape recorder, only. Three comments from respondents included (1) a report that the equipment was shared and thus not available every day, (2) that equipment and tapes were not borrowed because of tape damage which had occurred las year, and (3) one regular teacher was unable to work with one L/LD teacher.

The second process evaluation question in the series of seven asked, "Do regular classroom teachers who have been working with L/LD teachers report they are using the controlled reader to a greater extent in their instructional program as a result of working with the resource room teacher?" Interviewees responded to six questions which related to the use of the controlled reader. Data derived from these questions indicated that twenty percent of the group had borrowed the controlled reader from the resource room while eighty percent had not. One teacher indicated that she had one which had been gotten from another source besides the L/LD teacher. Twenty percent of the group also reported that they had learned to individualize with the controlled reader from an L/LD teacher while the remaining eighty percent had not.

An additional item relating to the use of the controlled reader elicited an eighteen percent affirmative response from teachers. This question asked if the regular classroom teacher had ever sent a child to the resource room in the afternoon to use the controlled reader. Of the eighty-two percent negative responses, one teacher commented that she did not have that priviledge while another noted that some students went "on their own."

Teachers were asked further if they knew how to diagnose and check reading errors on the controlled reader. Sixty-five percent of the group responded that they did understand these concepts while the remaining thirty-five percent had not. Of the latter group, one person commented that her intentions were to make future use of the controlled reader in this manner. Seventy percent indicated that they would use the controlled reader daily in the regular classroom if it were available. The remaining thirty percent indicated that they preferred not to use this machine every day.

Awareness of the importance of the controlled reader prior to 1970 was affirmed by forty percent of the interviewees. Some had gaines experience with this machine through Title I. The remaining sixty percent of the respondents were not cognizant of the value of the controlled reader prior to 1970.

The third evaluation question asked, "Do regular classroom teachers who have been working with L/LD teachers report they are using the overhead projector to a greater extent in their instructional program as a result of working with the resource room teachers?" Five interview items elicited information concerning this question from the twenty regular classroom teachers who were questioned by ESC personnel. Fifty percent of the teachers indicated that they did use the overhead for art while the remainder did not. Further data indicated that ten percent of the group have acquired techniques used by the L/LD program with regard to the overhead projector. Of the ninety percent negative respondents, one comment indicated that the teacher had been aware of these techniques prior to their use with L/LD; another teacher reported that she had gained her information from experience with Title I; a third teacher learned the use of the overhead at a Kilgore ESC workshop.

Additional interview responses indicated that forty percent of the teachers used the overhead with students on an individual basis while the remaining sixty percent did not. Ninety percent of the interviewees used this machine for motivational purposes, while twenty percent of the teachers questioned reported sharing an overhead projector with an L/LD teacher. The remaining eighty percent of the group had not shared the equipment with an L/LD teacher.

Comments concerning the sharing of this equipment indicated that various arrangements existed. For example, some shared with the teacher next door while others shared with teachers of one grade level. In still another instance, the equipment was available at the Library.

The fourth evaluation question was stated as follows, "Do regular classroom teachers who have been working with L/LD teachers report they are using SRA or RFU kits to a greater extent in their instructional program as a result of working with resource room teachers?" Ninety percent of the teachers reported that L/LD teachers did not share SRA or RFU kits with them while the remaining ten percent responded affirmatively to the question regarding sharing. Forty-five percent of the teachers had their own SRA kit while the remaining fifty-five percent did not. Prior to 1970 forty percent of the teachers queried used an SRA kit while the remaining sixty percent did not. The use of an SRA kit in charting students' progress was reported by thirty-five percent of the teachers interviewed while the remaining sixty-five percent made no such use. One teacher reported that her students did their own charting.

The fifth of seven evaluation questions was, "Do regular classroom teachers who have been working with L/LD teachers report they are using AVK Cards and Tapes to a greater extent in their instructional program as a result of working with the resource room teachers?" Of the twenty teachers interviewed, eighty-five percent reported that they had not made their own AVK Cards, while the remaining fifteen percent responded affirmatively. One teacher commented that she had brought her AVK Cards from her Title I class. Ninety-five percent of the teachers reported that they had not jumped the AVK Tapes made for the L/LD program. One person commented on her fear that she would damage the other teacher's materials. Dictating their own AVK tapes was accomplished by twenty percent of the respondents while the remaining eighty percent had not. L/LD teachers reportedly shared their AVK Tapes and Cards with fifteen percent of the regular teachers who were interviewed. The remaining eighty-five percent had not received tapes from L/LD teachers. One person reported that she had not asked for these items while five reported that they were not familiar with AVK. Twenty-five percent of the interviewees reported instruction had been provided them by a resource room teacher. The remaining seventy-five percent had no such assistance.

The sixth evaluation question stated, "Do regular classroom teachers who have been working with L/LD teachers report they are using special programmed workbooks to a greater extent in their instructional program as the result of working with the resource room teachers?" Forty-two percent of the teachers questioned reported that resource room teachers had offered to send programmed workbooks in the afternoon when L/LD students were in regular classroom. Fifty-eight percent of the teachers responded negatively to this question. One person remarked that while workbooks were not sent, other materials were. When asked if the interviewee cooperated with the L/LD teacher in utilizing these books in the afternoon when the student cannot work on his grade level, thirty-seven percent of the teachers responded, "yes." Of the sixty-three negative responses, one person commented that, "we do committee work" while another added that she would use workbooks if they were needed.

Forty-two percent of the teachers reported that they had checked students' work done in workbooks in the afternoon while the remaining fifty-eight percent had not. Forty-seven percent of the regular teachers reported that resource room teachers did check the workbooks of children working on them in the afternoon.

Additional comments from this group of teachers included remarks from four teachers. One interviewee felt that students should, "do work on the grade level in which they are enrolled." Another reported that she purchased workbooks with personal funds while another reported that a child often brought his own work to afternoon classes, but this did not include workbooks. The fourth added that L/LD teachers had not offered her anything. A fifth teacher did not answer any of the workbook oriented questions as she thought they were not applicable.

The final process evaluation question in this series asked, "Do regular classroom teachers who have been working with L/LD teachers report they are using other instructional materials (i.e., Flash X, Cyclo Teacher, etc.) to a greater extent in their instructional program as a result of working with the resource room teachers?" Seven questions were asked in order to provide feedback for the evaluation question. To the first of these, sixty-five percent of the teachers responded affirmatively that they had observed the use of the Flash X. Thirty-five percent had not. Five percent of the group reported the use of the Flash X in the classroom while the remaining ninety-five percent did not make use of this technique.

Additional data obtained in regard to the question evaluating the use of various machines and techniques indicated that forty-two percent of the respondents had observed the use of the Cyclo Teacher. Fifty-eight percent had not. Further, ten percent of the interviewees reported using the Cyclo Teacher in their classroom while the remaining ninety percent had not.

The use of flashcards was reported by sixty-five percent of the teachers questioned. Also data indicated that forty percent of the regular teachers who were interviewed had borrowed various dittoed supplementary material for individual needs from the L/LD teacher.

Teachers added comments to their responses, indicating that one had made or bought her own materials; another had future plans for utilization of these instructional materials; a third had borrowed materials not listed on the Interview Schedule.

Part III. A third group of teachers was selected to represent regular classroom teachers who had volunteered to implement individualized instruction into a traditional classroom setting. The entire group was utilized in this data gathering activity conducted by ESC personnel. A different Interview Schedule was used and is reflected in the data described below.

Three process evaluation questions served as focal points into which results of the interview questions were funneled. The first of these three asked, "Do regular classroom teachers who have volunteered to implement individualized instruction in a traditional setting feel the L/LD program is better meeting its objectives during the current year (as compared to previous years)?" Results of the interview with the volunteers indicated that twenty-nine percent felt that the L/LD program was successful to a great extent in meeting its objectives in 1970. Twenty-four percent of the respondents felt that success would more accurately be termed "to a limited extent." Forty-one percent of the group did not have an opinion while six percent felt that the program definitely not met its objectives during 1970. One negative respondent commented that she did not know what the objectives were.

Fifty percent of the teachers reported that they felt the L/LD program had successfully (to a great extent) met its objectives during the current year. Thirty-one percent of the group felt that limited success had been experiences while nineteen percent had no opinion to report. Two comments included "this year seems better," and "many slow learners were initially picked by mistake."

Teacher comments related to two broad areas of change among students. One of these growth areas was in attitude, motivational level, independence, and frustration tolerance; these characteristics might be loosely placed under an affective or temperament umbrella. Change was reported which fell generally under a cognitive domain. Included were general academic advancement, growth in specific areas such as Reading or Spelling, and change among students in their tendency to compete with each other.

Teachers' verbatim comments are listed below in order of decreasing frequency and by the loose groupings described above, beginning with the affective characteristics. Six comments relating to attitude were as follows:

> Children (are) learning more. Children love it; they can advance freely. Enthusiasm (is observed) in child. Enjoyment of children (is observed). Enthusiasm is very noticeable. Greatest is attitude of children; (they are) more interested and enthusiastic. Change (is observed) and behavior and attitude toward school. (Students) enjoy things better; children enjoy checking on work; can see what they are doing.

Changes in student motivation were reflected in the comments made by teachers. Responses were reported by interviewers as follows: "(L/LD class) motivates slow ones. Motivation growth (is observed). They are more excited about what they are doing. Each child feels immediate success."

Changes in students' independence were observed as follows: "Students are better able to work on their own. Students think more of themselves - maturity. (Students are) more willing to try on their own."

Changes grouped under the heading of cognitive gains were listed in greatest frequency under a sub-heading of "Advancing." These included:

> They are advancing. Children (are) learning more. Students (are) going forward. I can see a broadening of interest. Children are working at their level. (There is a) large increase in percentile rank on achievement tests. Kids are ready and learn faster; they have the background. Slower students are not as frustrated; (they are) working at (their) own level.

Teachers made comments relating to specific subject matter areas as follows:

> They are reading; last year some couldn't. Children of suspected perceptual difficulties are reading. Children are reading ahead. Reading is better. Improvement (is noted) in reading and writing. There is an interest in Spelling. Spelling and Reading are better.

Teachers commented on the positive impact of the L/LD program upon the above average students as follows: "The child (is helpful) who is capable of going fast, to proceed beyond average. Advanced students move quicker. The brighter students especially are able to progress at greater speed." Concerning the underachiever,

teachers related that, "It (the L/LD class) helps the underachiever not to become neglected." The L/LD program also reportedly helps, "remove the competitive aura from reading."

A second process evaluation question related to the impact of the L/LD program upon promoting individualized instruction within the school system. It was stated as follows, "Do regular classroom teachers who have volunteered to implement individualized instruction in a traditional setting feel that the L/LD program was instrumental in getting individualized instruction within the school system?" One-hundred precent of the regular classroom teachers felt that, indeed, the L/LD program had been instrumental in promoting individualized instruction within the system.

The third and final evaluation question concerning this group of interviewees asked, "Do regular classroom teachers who have volunteered to implement individualized instruction in a traditional setting feel that parents are reacting favorably toward individualization of instruction for their children?" Fifty-six percent of the respondents answered affirmatively, "to a great extent." Thirty-nine percent felt that the parents and students felt favorably toward the program "to a limited extent." Six percent reportedly had no opinion. Five teachers in the group made comments indicating that they questioned the extent of parents' awareness of the L/LD program and its workings.

Part IV. The specific involvement of parents with the L/LD program was investigated by means of the following evaluation question, "Are parents of L/LD children involved in the L/LD program as evidenced by extensive home, school and telephone contact between L/LD teachers and parents and by parent participation the the MACLD (Marshall Association for Children with Learning Disabilities)?" All L/LD teachers in the Marshall system were contacted and requested to provide information as to home visits, school visits, telephone calls prior to January 15. 1973, representing approximately one school semester. Parent-teacher conferences were held in 345 home visits, in 737 school visits, and by means of 429 telephone calls. Parents and teachers made a total of 1,511 contacts with each other through the various means reported above.

Parent involvement as evidenced by the attendance at Marshall Association for Children with Learning Disabilities meetings was reported in terms of the number of parents and the number of meetings per year. Data applies to activities prior to March 20, 1973. During the 1971-72 school year there were eight meetings of the Marshall Association for Children with Learning Disabilities. During the current year five meetings took place for a total of thirteen over the two year period. There were thirty-four members

in the MACLD in 1971-72. During the current year, a membership of forty-four was reported, representing an increase of 29.4% over the previous year. The composition of the first year group was evenly divided between teachers and parents while current-year membership was reflected as 25% teachers and 75% parents. At present the average meeting attendance is reported as forty, including visitors.

SUMMARY

Teachers and principals of nine Marshall Elementary Schools and one middle schools were interviewed by four Region VII ESC staff members. Information was gathered as to feelings, attitudes and practices relating to Marshall's L/LD program. Three groups were interviewed; these included ten principals, twenty regular classroom teachers, and eighteen teachers who had volunteered to individualize their instructional program.

All principals in charge of an L/LD program or of an individualized program were interviewed as were all teachers volunteering to individualize. The remaining group of regular classroom teachers was selected by drawing names from a hat.

Principals were questioned as to their opinions regarding parent problems, discipline problems, regular teacher attitudes, L/LD program cost-effectiveness, and scheduling. Without

exception, principals reported that favorable conditions existed regarding each of these variables. Parent problems were felt to have declined in number as a result of the impact of the L/LD program. Discipline problems have also been reduced in number with incidencies being fewer in the resource room than in the regular classroom.

Principals overwhelmingly responded in the affirmative that regular classroom teachers' attitudes and instructional programs have profited from the presence of the L/LD program. A similiar positive response was recorded in answer to the cost-effectiveness question. The majority of principals felt that this L/LD program was the best new program that they had seen in Marshall ISD. Scheduling appeared to present no problem to the majority of these principals.

Twenty regular classroom teachers were interviewed concerning their joint and independent use of various machines and techniques such as the audio tape recorder, the controlled reader, the overhead projector, SRA kits, RFU kits, AVK cards, tapes, and other instructional materials. While most of the teachers were aware of and made limited use of the tape recorder, the majority did not work closely with L/LD teachers in borrowing or duplicating machines or tapes. A growing awareness of the controlled reader

was reported, however, regular teachers working jointly with resource room teachers in the utilization of this machine were distinctly in the minority. These findings generally reflected those concerning the use of the overhead projector which was not generally shared with an L/LD teacher. Regular teachers did, however, make use of this machine in their instruction.

SRA or RFU kits were available to approximately half of the teachers interviewed. The source or availability of these kits was not generally a resource room teacher. More limited use of AVK cards and tapes was reported than any other machines or materials. Most regular teachers had not interacted with L/LD teachers regarding the use of these materials.

The greatest cooperative effort between these two groups concerned the use of special programmed workbooks. The utilization rate for workbooks was also highest when compared to other materials and machines.

Regular classroom teachers volunteering to individualize in their classroom reported their feelings as to meeting L/LD program objectives during the current year, implementing individualized instruction in the system, and parent feelings toward individualization. It was reported that the L/LD program had met its objectives more fully during the current year than in

the past. Responses were rather evenly divided as to the extent they felt these objectives had been met. Evidence of teacher observed positive impact of individualization focused upon academic growth and improved personal/social adjustment.

There was unanimous agreement that the L/LD program had promoted individualized instruction in the regular classroom and that parents felt favorable "to a greater extent" toward the program. This positive feeling and interest was reflected in over 1,500 visits with teachers and in active participation in the Marshall Association for Children with Learning Disabilities.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A - Principals-Frequency and Percentage Responses

APPENDIX B - Regular Teachers' Responses-Frequency and Percentages

APPENDIX C - Teachers Volunteering To Individualize-Frequency and Percentage of Responses

APPENDIX D - Parent Involvement

EVALUATION QUESTION	YES		NO		UNDECIDED	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
1.1 Do principals perceive the L/LD program as having a favorable impact on parental attitudes toward schools in the MISD and the ability of schools to meet the needs of students?						
1. Has the number of parent problems, created by educational needs not being met, subsided since 1970?	70	7	10	1	20	2
2. Is the majority of parent feedback one of satisfaction because the school is offering this kind of program?	100	10	0	0		
3. Do you have parents requesting their child be placed in L/LD?	80	8	20	2		
1.2 Do principals perceive the L/LD program as a program that reduces discipline problems among L/LD students?						

	YES*		YES**		NO	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
1. Are L/LD students as a group a discipline problem in the resource room?	10	1	0	0	90	9
Are these same L/LD students as a group a discipline problem in the regular classroom?	40	4	0	0	60	6

	YES		NO		UNDECIDED	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
2. Do you think they are discipline problems because their educational needs are not being met?	72		14		14	

1.3 Has the L/LD program, in your opinion of principals, had a favorable impact on the attitudes and instructional program of regular classroom teachers?

1. Do you feel the L/LD program has created positive change in instruction in the regular classroom?	90	9	0	0	10	1
2. Do you feel these changes can be attributed to being in a resource room?	80	8	20	2	0	0
3. Have teacher attitudes become more positive after they have seen the productiveness of the resource room?	80	8	10	1		

* (to a limited extent)
** (to a great extent)

	YES		NO		UNDECIDED	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
4. Has the L/LD staff educated your staff to the extent that they are:						
a. Able to tell a slow learner from a learning disabled child?	80	8	20	2		
b. Diagnose problems from test data?	80	8	20	2		
c. Diagnose problems from daily work?	70	7	30	3		
d. Diagnose problems from behavior patterns?	80	8	20	2		
5. Is there a difference between attitudes and work habits of the resource and regular teacher?	50	5	50	5		
1.4 Has the L/LD program, in the opinion of principals, proven to meet cost-effectiveness expectations in the MISD?						
1. Do you now feel that the overall effect and final product is worth the time and expense put into the L/LD development design?	90	9	10	1	0	0

	YES		NO		UNDECIDED	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
2. Do you think the effectiveness has been greater in this program than other new programs the school district has implemented?	80	8	0	0	20	2
3. Are you budgeting your school money to buy materials and equipment for individualized instruction?	90	9	10	1		
1.5 Has adequate building level scheduling of L/LD classes been possible?						
1. Has the special scheduling that the Marshall ISD L/LD program requires been difficult to organize?	20	2	80	8		

2.1 Do regular classroom teachers who have been working with L/LD teachers report they are using audio tape recorders to a greater extent in their instructional program as a result of working with the resource room teachers?	YES %	YES Freq.	NO %	NO Freq.
Tape Recorders				
A. Have you ever borrowed the tape recorder from the resource teacher?	15	3	85	17
B. Have you started using the tape recorder as a result of your working cooperatively with the L/LD teacher with learning disabled children?	35	7	65	13
C. Have you attended workshops that would perfect your skill in using the tape recorder?	70	14	30	6
D. Have you borrowed tapes from the resource teacher?	15	3	85	17

	YES		NO	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
E. Have you jumped tapes for your own instructional use that were devised by the L/LD teachers?	15	3	85	17
F. Do you now have a listening station and tape recorder that you use daily in your classroom?	10	2	90	18
G. Did you use tape recorders and listening stations before 1970?	25	5	75	15

2.2 Do regular classroom teachers who have been working with L/LD teachers report they are using the controlled reader to a greater extent in their instructional program as a result of working with the resource room teachers?

Controlled Reader

A. Have you ever borrowed the controlled reader from the resource room?	20	4	80	16
B. Have you learned how to individualize with the controlled reader from an L/LD teacher?	20	4	80	16
C. Have you ever sent a child to the resource room in the afternoon to use the controlled reader?	18	2	82	9

	YES		NO	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
D. Do you know how to diagnose and check reading errors on the controlled reader?	65	13	35	7
E. Would you use the controlled reader daily in the regular classroom (if available?)	70	14	30	6
F. Were you aware of the importance of the controlled reader and how to utilize it before 1970?	40	8	60	12

2.3 Do regular classroom teachers who have been working with L/LD teachers report they are using the overhead projector to a greater extent in their instructional program as a result of working with the resource room teachers?

III. Overhead Projector

A. Do you use the overhead for art?	50	10	50	10
B. Did you acquire any of the techniques that the L/LD program uses with the overhead projector?	10	2	90	18

	YES		NO	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
C. Do you use the overhead with students on an individual basis?	40	8	60	12
D. Do you use the overhead for motivational purposes?	90	18	10	2
E. Do you share an overhead projector with an L/LD teacher?	20	4	80	16

2.4 Do regular classroom teachers who have been working with L/LD teachers report they are using SRA or RFU kits to a greater extent in their instructional program as a result of working with the resource room teachers?

SRA or RFU Kits

A. Does an L/LD teacher share an SRA or RFU Kit with you?	10	2	90	18
B. Do you own your own SRA kit?	45	9	55	11
C. Did you use an SRA kit in your class before 1970?	40	8	60	12

	YES		NO	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
D. Are you charting progress of students' work on the SRA Kit?	35	7	65	13

2.5 Do regular classroom teachers who have been working with L/LD teachers report they are using AVK Cards and Tapes to a greater extent in their instructional program as a result of working with the resource room teachers?

AVK Cards and Tapes

A. Have you made your own AVK cards?	15	3	85	17
B. Did you jump the AVK tapes made by the L/LD program?	5	1	95	19
C. Have you dictated your own AVK tapes?	20	4	80	16
D. Does the L/LD teacher share her AVK tapes and cards with you?	15	3	85	17
E. Did a resource room teacher instruct you in how to make cards and tapes?	25	5	75	15

2.6 Do regular classroom teachers who have been working with L/LD teachers report they are using Special Programmed Workbooks to a greater extent in their instructional program as a result of working with the resource room teachers?	YES %	YES Freq.	NO %	NO Freq.
Special Programmed Workbooks from Resource Room				
A. Have the resource room teachers offered to send programmed workbooks in the afternoon when L/LD students are in the regular classroom?	42	8	58	11
B. Have you cooperated with the L/LD teacher in utilizing these books in the afternoon when the student cannot work on his grade level?	37	7	63	12
C. Have you checked the students' work that he does in the workbooks in the afternoon?	42	8	58	11
D. Does the resource room teacher check the workbooks that the child works on in the afternoon?	47	9	53	10

2.7 Do regular classroom teachers who have been working with L/LD teachers report they are using other instructional materials (i.e. Flash X, Cyclo Teacher, etc.) to a greater extent in their instructional program as a result of working with the resource room teachers?	YES %	YES Freq.	NO %	NO Freq.
Other Instructional Materials				
A. Have you observed the use of the Flash X?	65	13	35	7
B. Are you using the Flash X in your classroom?	5	1	95	19
C. Have you observed the use of the Cyclo teacher?	42	8	58	11
D. Are you using the Cyclo teacher in your classroom?	10	2	90	18
E. Are you using various kinds of flash cards in your room?	65	13	35	7
F. Have you only begun to use flash cards with these techniques since 1970?	10	2	90	18
G. Have you borrowed various dittoed supplementary material for individual needs from the L/LD teacher?	40	8	60	12

	No Opinion		Definitely Not		Yes*		Yes**	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
3.1 Do regular classroom teachers who have volunteered to implement individualized instruction in a traditional setting feel the L/LD program is better meeting its objectives during the current year (as compared to previous years)?								
Was the L/LD program successful in meeting its objectives in 1970?	41	7	6	1	24	4	29	5
Is the L/LD program successfully meeting its objectives this current year?	19	3	0	0	31	6	50	8

* (to a limited extent)
** (to a great extent)

What significant progress have you seen in your class this year in comparison with last year?

Teacher A:

They are reading - last year some couldn't.
They are advancing.
There is an interest in Spelling.

Teacher B:

Kids aren't frustrated.
Kids are ready and learn faster-they have the background.

Teacher C:

Children learning more
Attitudinal development is much better. (Discipline is much better.)

Teacher D:

Children love - they can advance freely.
Motivates slow ones.

Teacher E:

Motivation growth
Enthusiasm in child
Removed competitive aura from reading.

Teacher F:

It helps underachiever not to become neglected.
Child who is capable of going fast, to proceed beyond average.

Teacher G:

Advanced students moved quicker.
Slower students are not as frustrated, working at own level.

Teacher H:

Students are better able to work on their own.

Teacher I:

Improvement in reading and writing
Enjoyment of children

Teacher J:

Children of suspected perceptional difficulties are reading.
Children are working at their level.

Teacher K:

Going forward
Enthusiasm is very noticeable.
I can see a broadening of interests.

Teacher L:

Greatest is the attitude of children-more interested and enthusiastic
Not committed - because a matter of themselves.

Teacher M:

We got a slow start in reading this year, as compared to last year, we are behind.
It is hard to compare the different classes.
The state adopted language book is too hard, so we have supplemented this - so this is <u>not</u> progress over last year.

Teacher N:

Students think more themselves - maturity
More willing to try on their own
Large increase on %ile rank achievement test

Teacher O:

More individualized help has been available.
A better understanding of children & problems.

Teacher P:

Gives the children more attention. The brighter students especially are able to progress at greater speed. Also, helps the slower ones. Gives them more to do. Keeps them all busy. Children are reading ahead.

Teacher Q:

They are more excited about what they are doing.
Spelling and reading is better.
Enjoy things better - children enjoy checking own work - can see what they are doing.

Teacher R:

Change in behavior and attitude toward school.
Each child feels immediate success.
Better coordination in fine-motor control.

		Yes	
		%	Freq.
3.2	Do regular classroom teachers who have volunteered to implement individualized instruction in a traditional setting feel that the L/LD program was instrumental in getting individualized instruction within the school system?		
	Do you feel that the L/LD program has been instrumental in getting individualization implemented within the school system?	100	19

		No Opinion		Yes*		Yes**	
		%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
3.3	Do regular classroom teachers who have volunteered to implement individualized instruction in a traditional setting feel that parents are reacting favorably toward individualization of instruction for their children?						
	Do you think parents of your students feel favorably about what you are doing?	6	1	39	7	56	10

* (to a limited extent)
** (to a great extent)

4.1 Are parents of L/LD students involved in the L/LD program as evidenced by extensive home, school and telephone contacts between L/LD teachers and parents and by parent participation in the MACLD?

No. of meetings (1971-72)	No. of meetings (1972-73)	Total
8	5	13

No. of Members (1971-72)	No. of Members (1972-73)	Total
34	44	78

Home Visits (Prior to January 15, 1973)

345

School Visits (Prior to January 15, 1973)

737

Telephone Calls (Prior to January 15, 1973)

429